

Based on Defendant's representation to the Court that she has responded to all discovery requests, the Motion will be denied in that respect. If Plaintiff has not received the responses, he may file a second Motion to Compel.

As to the specific interrogatory, it is Plaintiff's burden to prove the relevance of the requested information. See In re Milo's Kitchen Dog Treats Consol. Cases, 307 F.R.D. 177, 179 (W.D. Pa. 2015). Plaintiff has not sustained this burden. He baldly asserts that the interrogatory "will lead to information that the Plaintiff will use in his Pretrial Narrative, Motion for Summary Judgment, and at Trial." ECF No. 93 ¶ 26. He does not describe the nature of such use or the relevance of the information sought. Accordingly, the Motion will be denied in this respect as well.

AND NOW, this 11th day of July, 2016, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Order Compelling Defendant Rossino Answers to Plaintiff Discovery Requests," ECF No. 93, is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Maureen P. Kelly
MAUREEN P. KELLY
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

cc: Shawn Thomas Moore
LZ-9799
SCI Pittsburgh
P O Box 99991
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

All counsel of record via electronic case filing